

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-17, and 19-21 were pending in the application. Claims 1-21 have been canceled. New claim 22 has been added. Support for the new claim can be found in Applicant's specification, at paragraphs 16, 17, 19-21, 23, and 24. No new matter has been introduced. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claim 22.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3, 5-7, 17, and 19-21 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang (US 6,738,811) in view of Chirashnya et al. (US 2002/0019870) hereafter referred to as Chirashnya.

Claim 22 is not unpatentable over Liang in view of Chirashnya because neither Liang nor Chirashnya teach or suggest the novel method of combining a Bayesian Network Model with a hybrid prediction system. As noted in prior communications, Liang is silent on the Bayesian Model. Chirashnya uses a Bayesian Model in his diagnostic system; however Chirashnya does not teach or suggest the incorporation of the hybrid prediction system into the Bayesian Model.

The Office Action rejected claim 4 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang in view of Chirashnya, and in further view of Odhner (US 6,862,623).

Claim 22 is not unpatentable over Liang in view of Chirashnya and in further view of Odhner because neither one of them teach or suggest recording a utilization parameter of a central processing unit in the cluster as part of the maintenance of a system parameter log, together implementing a hybrid prediction system with a Bayesian Network Model.

Serial Number 10/720,300
Docket Number YOR920030242US1
Amendment2 Page 6 of 6

The Office Action rejected claim 8 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang in view of Chirashnya and in further view of Castelli et al. (US 2003/0023719).

Claim 22 is not unpatentable over the cited references because they do not teach or suggest using a warning window as part of a hybrid prediction system and a Bayesian Network Model.

The Office Action rejected claims 9-16, and 19-21 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang in view of Chirashnya in further view of Harrop (US 7,225,250).

Claim 22 is not unpatentable over the cited references because they do not teach or suggest the elements of claim 22, in particular the combination of a Bayesian Network Model with a hybrid prediction system.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

**Digitally signed by Michael J.
Buchenhorner**

Michael J. Buchenhorner
Reg. No. 33,162

Date: June 3, 2008

Michael Buchenhorner, P.A.
8540 S.W. 83 Street
Miami, Florida 33143
(305) 273-8007 (voice)
(305) 595-9579 (fax)